

characters bear this out, and I suppose "Heliodinidæ" on page 49 will change to Heliozelidæ.

In the Pieridæ (at least in *Pieris rapæ*, *brassicæ*, and *daphidice*) certain of the most conspicuous setæ are undoubtedly the three upper primaries, as I have proved by breeding the first stages.¹ The crowd of secondary setæ which confuse the picture in the full-grown larva are much fewer in the second stage, appearing gradually stage by stage, and the history of setæ i, ii and iii is continuous; as to iv and v I feel much less certain, but suspect they are the two largest in the subventral region, as they have the same relative position, essentially, in stage one. When so traced the primaries of *Pieris rapæ* may be recognized by their light color, and i and ii by their glandular character.

Dr. Fracker's paper has a bibliography citing most of the articles mentioned above. The typical arrangement of muscles and skin-folds is given in Ann. Ent. Soc. Am., VII, 109, 1914.

NOTES ON ALLECULIDÆ (COLEOPTERA).

BY CHARLES W. LENG,

WEST NEW BRIGHTON, N. Y.

The name of this family was changed by Dr. G. Seidlitz in Erichson's *Insekten Deutschlands* because the former name was derived from *Cistela*, which was originally used by Geoffroy for an insect of a different family. Following Seidlitz the family Cistelidæ of our Check List becomes the family Alleculidæ of Junk's *Catalogus Coleopterorum*, constituting part 3, by F. Borchmann.

It is to be regretted that some errors may be detected in this author's work. *Mycetochara horni* Dury, Journ. Cin. Soc. Nat. Hist., XX, 1902, is omitted, *Tedinus angustus* Casey is cited as *angustatus*, *Prostenus californicus* Horn is cited as from California notwithstanding the remarks of Champion, Casey and Fall, which make it plain that its occurrence in California must have been accidental and its real home is Central America. The treatment of the genus

¹ Psyche, 1909, 69.

Lobopoda, by which two of the species are transferred to *Allecula*, is unwarranted, and they should be restored to *Lobopoda*.

The citation by Borchmann of "*Mycetochara rufipes* Lec. Bost. Journ., I, 1866, p. 170" is however the most interesting of the errors in that its investigation has led to the discovery of others. This species was actually described by the elder Leconte in Ann. Lyc. Nat. Hist. N. Y., I. 1824, p. 170, and was redescribed by the younger Leconte in New Spec. Col., 1866, p. 136, as a *Hymenorus*. According to Casey, who saw the type, it is however a *Mycetochara*. Gemminger & Harold cite "Bost. Jour., I, p. 170; New Spec. Col., 1866, p. 136," thus starting an error, which Casey inadvertently followed in Col. Not., III, in substituting "Bost. Journ." for "Ann. Lyc. N. Y." Borchmann apparently combined the Gemminger & Harold references to produce his citation "Bost. Journ., I, 1866, p. 170," in which nothing is correct but the page. Henshaw's Bibliography is correct; but his Check List is in error in citing both *Mycetochara rufipes* (7612) and *Hymenorus rufipes* (7596); the latter should be erased. Seidlitz is also in error (Erichson's Insekten Deutschlands) in citing a *rufipes* in each genus. I am indebted to Col. Casey for aid in unraveling this tangle, which makes it appear as if two species were involved, instead of one described in 1824.

All authors appear to agree in treating Ziegler's *Pseudocistela erythroptera* as a synonym of *brevis*, notwithstanding the striking difference in appearance caused by the reddish color of its elytra. While its description at this time might not be justifiable, I think it would be more in accordance with the facts to retain Ziegler's name, since it already stands in the literature, as a varietal name than to sink it in synonymy, and thereby possibly provoke a redescription at some future time of an insect that will always be noticeable in our collections.